

REMARKS

Claim 3 has been amended. Claims 1-24 are pending in the application.

§102 Rejections

Claims 1, 7-10 are rejected under 35 U.S.C 102(e) as being unpatentable over U.S. Patent No. 2002/0114470 (***Mauro II***). Applicants respectfully traverse this rejection.

For ease of illustration, claim 1 is discussed first. Claim 1, directed to a method, calls for (1) determining a private key for a first network based on at least one security value associated with a second network, wherein the private key refers to a key that, once calculated, is not shared with another device and (2) establishing a plurality of sessions between a mobile terminal and the first network using the private key.

The Examiner's rejection is not correct because ***Mauro II*** does not teach at least one of the claimed features. For example, claim 1, in part, calls for a first network and a second network. The Examiner argues that ***Mauro II*** teaches this claimed feature (*see* Final Office Action, dated Dec. 10, 2008) because ***Mauro II*** discloses "examples of digital wireless communications systems." *See Mauro II*, ¶[0005] (Background). The cited passage in ***Mauro II*** discusses that multiple kinds of communications systems may be used for transmitting data, in addition to voice communications. ***Mauro II*** generally teaches a "fast cryptographic key generation" between two communications devices in a *single* communications system (*i.e.*, one network, not two). *See Mauro II*, ¶¶[0009] & [0021]. In other words, the communications between the devices described in ***Mauro II*** are communications between devices on the *same* network. ***Mauro II*** is silent with respect to a first network and a second network, as called for in claim 1. As such, ***Mauro II*** does not, and cannot teach all the features of claim 1.

Additionally, because ***Mauro II*** does not teach a first network and a second network, it follows that ***Mauro II*** does not teach determining a private key for a first network based on at

least one security value associated with a second network. In contrast, claim 1 calls for such a feature.

In view of at least the aforementioned reasons, claim 1 and its dependent claims are allowable. Additionally, the other independent claims (11 & 20) and their respective dependent claims are also allowable for the same reasons.

§103 Rejections

The Examiner rejected claims 3, 5, 6, 14-19, 22, 23 under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over *Mauro II* in view of U.S. Pub. 2002/0174335 (*Zhang*), further in view of U.S. Pub. 2002/0085516 (*Bridgelall*). Applicants respectfully traverse this rejection.

With respect to certain dependent claims, the Office Action is traversed for at least the further reasons presented below. Claim 2 calls for determining the private key based on a shared secret data key (SSD key) associated with the cellular network. An SSD key, as known to those of skill in the art, is a 128-bit key used in authentication and shared key generation. The Examiner argues this feature is taught in paragraphs 5 & 21 of *Mauro II*. The cited paragraphs describe types of wireless communications systems for transmitting data as well as generating a private key using a processor of the user device. The cited passages do not, however, describe a shared secret data key (SSD key), as called for by claim 2. For at least this reason, it is submitted that claim 2 and its dependent claims are allowable. For similar reasons, claims 12 and 21, along with their respective dependent claims are also allowable.

The Examiner rejected claims 2, 4, 11-13, 20, 21, 24 under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) as being unpatentable over *Mauro II*, in view of *Zhang*. Applicants respectfully traverse this rejection.

Claim 4 calls for populating the private key with a cryptographic transform of the shared secret data key (SSD key). The Examiner argues this feature is taught in paragraph 21 of *Mauro II*. The cited paragraph describes generating a private key using a processor of the user device.

It does not, however, describe a cryptographic transform, and certainly does not describe populating the private key with such a transform of the shared secret data key (SSD key), as called for by claim 4. For at least this reason, it is submitted that claim 4 is allowable. For substantially the same reasons, it is submitted that claim 13 is allowable.

Reconsideration of the instant Application is respectfully requested.

For the aforementioned reasons, it is respectfully submitted that all claims pending in the present application are in condition for allowance. The Examiner is invited to contact the undersigned at (713) 934-4064 with any questions, comments or suggestions relating to the referenced patent application and this response.

Respectfully submitted,

Date: February 10, 2009

By: /Ruben S. Bains/
Ruben S. Bains
Reg. No. 46,532
Williams Morgan & Amerson, P.C.
10333 Richmond Avenue, Suite 1100
Houston, TX 77042
(713) 934-4064
(713) 934-7011 (Fax)
ATTORNEY FOR APPLICANT(S)